DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 219 FL 008 367

AUTHOR	Kunkle, John F., Ed.
TITLE	Bilingual Education and FLES: Keeping the Child in Focus. A Report by the 1974 FLES and Bilingual Education Section of the American Association of Teachers of French.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Teachers of French.
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	78p.
AVAILABLE FROM	MLA Publications Center, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Community Involvement; Curriculum Development; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Policy; *Elementary Education; Elementary School Curriculum; *Fles; Fles Programs; Fles Teachers; *French; *Language Instruction; Language Programs; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; *Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS	Louisiana

ABSTRACT

This report presents eight articles dealing with several aspects of foreign languages in the elementary schools (FLES) and bilingual education. "Why? What? How?" by M. Woodruff presents a view of the present situation of and future potential for FLES in the U.S. In "Reaction to: 'Why? What? How?'" R. Brooks raises questions regarding FLES's needs and the influence of professional organizations in this area. "Prescription for FLES: Positive Action" by V. Gramer makes a case for action by FLES teachers to develop positive attitudes toward and high standards for FLES. "Three Myths that Almost Killed FLES" by P. P. Parent discusses FLES viewed in the context of the child's whole education. "FLES Can Be ...." by G. C. Lipton advocates a flexible approach to defining FLES programs. "FLES Supports Bilingual Education and Vice Versa in the Louisiana Experiment" by H. B. Dyess presents a history of FLES in Louisiana and its cooperation with bilingual education. "Community and Parent Involvement in Bilingual Education for the Disadvantaged" by C. Prudhomme discusses the needs and involvement of parents of disadvantaged children in bilingual education. "A Bilingual Program Grows Up" by J. McSpadden describes in allegory the 5-year growth of the Lafayette Parish Bilingual Program in Louisiana. A list of past chairmen of the National FLES Committee of the AATF completes the volume. (AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED135219

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A Report by the 1974
FLES and Bilingual Education
Section of the American
Association of Teachers of French

Bilingual Education and FLES: Keeping the Child in Focus

FL008367

Editor: John F. Kunkle

Presented:
December 1975
New Orleans, Louisiana

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND FLES: KEEPING THE CHILD IN FOCUS

A REPORT BY THE

FLES-BILINGUAL EDUCATION SECTION

OF THE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF

TEACHERS OF FRENCH

Chairman

John F. Kunkle
University of Southwestern
Louisiana

Committee

Anita A. Cipriani
Hunter College Elementary
School

P. Paul Parent
Purdue University

Presented
December, 1975

1975 by FLES-Bilingual Section of the American Association
of Teachers of French

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Publications of the National FLES Committee.....	iii
Why? What? How?.....Melba Woodruff	1
Reaction to: Why? What? How?.....Robert Brooks	11
Prescription for FLES: Positive Action.....Virginia Gramer	20
Three Myths that Almost Killed FLES.....P. Paul Parent	31
FLES Can Be_____*.....Gladys C. Lipton	41
FLES Supports Bilingual Education and Vice Versa in the Louisiana Experiment.....Homer B. Dyess	45
Community and Parent Involvement in Bilingual Education for the Disadvantaged.....Catherine Prudhomme	54
A Bilingual Program Grows Up.....Joseph McSpadden	67
Past Chairmen (National FLES Committee/ FLES-Bilingual Education Section).....	71

PUBLICATIONS OF THE NATIONAL FLES COMMITTEE

The FLES Committee of the American Association of Teachers of French since its founding in 1961 has consistently published an annual report on important issues related to foreign language instruction at the elementary level. In 1973 it was transformed into the FLES--Bilingual Section. The following are the publications of this section and the locations from which they can be obtained:

Year	Topic	Order From
1964	Reading at the FLES Level	Dr. Gladys Lipton Bureau of Foreign Language 131 Livingston St. Brooklyn, NY 11201
1965	Culture in the FLES Program	Rand McNally and Co. Box 7600 Chicago, IL 60680
1966	FLES and the Objectives of the Contemporary Elementary Schools	Rand McNally and Co. Box 7600 Chicago, IL 60680
1967	The FLES Student: A Study	Rand McNally and Co. Box 7600 Chicago, IL 60680
1968	FLES: Projections into the Future $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011

1969	The Three R's of FLES: Research, Relevance, Reality $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
1970	FLES: Patterns for Change $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
1971	FLES: Goals and Guides $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
1972	FLES: U.S.A. - Success Stories $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
1973	Foreign Language Teaching Techniques in FLES and Bilingual Settings $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011
1974	FLES and Bilingual Education: Getting the Word Out $5.00	MLA Publications Center 62 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10011

These reports are also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P. O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. Microfiche copies are $.83 each. Full-size copy depends on the number of pages. Consult copies of Resources in Education for abstracts of each volume and full-size reprint price. The ERIC numbers on the reports are:

1964	ED 093 151
1965	ED 081 294
1966	ED 081 293
1967	ED 081 289

1968	ED 077 304
1969	ED 077 303
1970	ED 077 302
1971	ED 093 149
1972	ED 093 150
1973	ED 101 586
1974	ED 101 170

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the Executive Committee of the American Association of Teachers of French for its continued support of this section and encouragement through the years.

WHY? WHAT? HOW?

Melba D. Woodruff
The Ohio State University

In the minds of all those involved in FLES, there is no doubt about the value and importance of a foreign language experience for young children. But the reasons why it is valuable and the emphases that make it valuable may not always be clearly expressed or even understood.

In a small plaza in Valladolid, Spain, near the Plaza Mayor, there is a huge sign on one of the buildings: FLES, SA . This Spanish organization does not refer to foreign language in the elementary school, but Sociedad Anonima does seem to describe the structure of FLES in the United States. FLES is anonymous in the sense that there is input and effort in varying amounts by many committed people, but it is not known how much, where, or by whom; the general public has only a vague image of FLES, its values, and its practices. What follows is the writer's perception of the present situation and potential for the future.

It is important that each school system in the United States assess and fulfll its own needs in FLES

as well as in other areas, but all school systems have the right to turn to state or national leadership and find involved and informed people who share certain fundamental assumptions about rationales, guidelines, and expectations.

Meetings and conferences--local, state, or national--too often consist either of testimonials that FLES is still alive or of strategy sessions to keep it alive. The testimonials are narrative accounts of current programs, success techniques, and pupil interest or enthusiasm; they rarely discuss the achievement of stated objectives in terms of child behavior. Accounts in the professional literature tend to follow similar lines. The strategy sessions are often discussions of frustrations in communicating with administrators and/or elementary classroom teachers and/or the "upper-level" foreign language teachers.

Although much has been written and said about FLES by both foreign language experts and specialists in elementary education, there has been little dialogue between the two groups. There is no national agreement about objectives, and both the foreign language teacher and the elementary school teacher interested in foreign language feel isolated and without support. While the two groups might even agree in theory, the practices in

the classroom may not illustrate the theory, partly because necessary aids, materials, or guidelines do not exist.

As some programs are abandoned, others are springing up, indicating that there does indeed seem to be renewed interest in FLES. Whatever the reasons for it, the response of concerned professionals should be immediate. Much of the new interest in FLES seems to stem from current projects in bilingual education (primarily Spanish-English and French-English). Bilingual education and FLES are however quite different, and this liaison could be dangerous unless the distinctions between the two are recognized, and objectives and expectations for each are clearly delineated. Presently, "bilingual" must be defined each time it is used, since it may describe both programs involving monolingual children trying to master a second language and programs for children who speak two languages (one of which may be nonstandard or a dialect) with equal or unequal fluency in the two. In a recent description of a biracial, bilingual experiment in Cincinnati, Ohio, the project directors pointed out the distinction between their use of bilingual (education in two languages for monolingual children) and the meaning of bilingual in Title VII projects (education in two languages for children who speak French or Spanish as a native language,

and who must learn English as inhabitants of the United States). The Cincinnati project is a nine-year commitment to combat "lingui-chauvinism" in the belief that the modern world requires that every educated American be comfortable in speaking at least one language other than English. To the isolationists who ask why anyone should spend time in learning to speak another language, one might respond that most of its value lies in the process of learning how to talk, since man's speech is the essence of his relationships with others.

This kind of project seems to be a constructive step in a direction toward international understanding, but by what criteria are such projects being evaluated: linguistic concepts? cultural understanding? general achievement in all areas? attitudes in one or several of many domains? progress in English?

"Failures" in FLES have been plagued by public expectations: producing a "native speaker" of the foreign language, preparing the child for continuing the foreign language sequence in junior high school or middle school into high school. We have ignored the fact that a foreign language experience is the only way for a child to gain a multidimensional view of language-culture--a view that enables him to look at his own from another perspective.

RATIONALE

While it is necessary to spell out how any given objectives are to be reached, it is equally important to state a rationale for FLES so that meaningful objectives may be subsequently identified. Recent relevant research shows a positive correlation between "divergent thinking" and second-language learning in early childhood. These data imply flexibility and adaptability: a growing ability to cope with the rapid change so characteristic of today's world, the opportunity to participate in the development of languages and communication, the capacity to "hear" others, the chance to walk that mile in someone else's shoes. A startling fact is that ninety percent of the world's population speak languages other than English and live in different cultural environments.

In this writer's opinion, it is the right of all children in the elementary school to have the opportunity for experiences in a foreign language-culture. A foreign language component in the elementary school core curriculum is mandated if our basic educational philosophy involves providing for children experiences that help them learn to live harmoniously and purposefully in the world. This perspective implies two dimensions for each child: how he views himself (his own way of living and speaking)

and how he fits into his community . . . locally, nationally, internationally.

Expressed needs on the national level dictate the beginning of foreign language in the elementary school where children can have experiences in learning how to learn another language and how to think in another culture so they may eventually be ready to consider career opportunities requiring performance with sensitivity to others in thought and expression.

This kind of rationale suits the philosophy and objectives of the elementary classroom teacher. Objectives can easily be set up as an outgrowth of the rationale. With appropriate procedures, then, the FLES class can be integrated into the rest of the child's day, and there can be mutual benefits for both the elementary teacher and the foreign language teacher. If, however, foreign language teachers at the elementary school level "go down one road" while the elementary school teachers travel along another, the future for FLES is dim.

PROPOSAL: (I) Minimal Objectives

In an effort to stabilize the FLES movement, concerted efforts should be made toward the development of specific objectives and the preparation of relevant

materials. As a result, the national attitude toward "communication" might change, and who knows what far-reaching effects that could have?

To bring about these concerted efforts, national committees of FLES specialists and elementary school specialists (one for each of the languages commonly taught in the elementary school) could be appointed to work out sets of minimal behavioral objectives: linguistic, cultural, attitudinal. Native consultants should be made available to the committees.

The minimal objectives in language could be established according to structures that are commonly used and understood by children:

Who is it?	Who are they?
What is it?	What are they?
Where is it?	Where are they?
What time is it?	What day? What month?
What color . . .?	
How old . . .?	
What . . .?	
Where . . .?	and so on.

These structures should be carefully chosen, limited in number, and listed in order of difficulty. The committees should consist of people who are aware of linguistic differences and sequences. No attention should be paid at this time to the many vocabulary items needed to fill out the structures.

The minimal objectives in culture should be geared to the child's world, and should include recognition of

both differences and similarities, with special emphasis on breaking down stereotypes.

The attitudinal objectives can be modest and simply stated, as for example:

> When the child is asked if he likes the foreign language class, he replies "yes".
> When presented with two pictures, the child correctly identifies a specific cultural difference.

(II) Materials

The present dearth of materials usable at the elementary school level is a catastrophe, and funding of some kind seems necessary for the implementation of objectives set up by the national committees; one group would be needed for each language-culture to work on the preparation of materials needed in order to achieve the minimal objectives and to provide for a wide variety of experiences.

Units, written in English for the most part, should be developed in relevant areas (social studies, music, art, geography, arithmetic, physical education, and so on), with the study of language and cultural similarities and differences as the basic core within each unit.

For instance, a unit in physical education might include "beísbol"; when a child learns about jonrón, aut, eséif, and estraic, he can also learn about

pronunciation differences, "borrowed" words, and the spread of interest in baseball.

A unit in social studies might discuss the French calender which begins the week with lun/di (Mon/day), and then goes to mar/di (Tues/day), mercre/di (Wednes/day) and so on. When asked appropriate questions, the child discovers many interesting similarities and differences; he also finds out that the calender was influenced centuries ago by peoples who named the days and months after their gods, but that samedi and dimanche are Christian in origin in contrast with "Saturday" and "Sunday" in English.

Each unit should be complete in itself, available separately, with suggestions for use, with descriptions of techniques and games, with a short bibliography for special interests of children, and with lists of basic and alternative vocabulary to complete the basic structures (minimal objectives). A comparative perception of the child's own language and culture should be implicit in the way the materials are organized and the questions asked.

CONCLUSION

In the past, FLES teachers have been trapped by trying to build a six-to-nine-year continuum toward

mastery in the skills of one foreign language. The idea was that, without proper articulation or continuity, FLES was useless. Let us admit that we were wrong, that even only one year of a FLES language-culture study can have inherent value, that it is indeed worthwhile, and that it can help a child appreciate himself and others. Let us set down in print, for all to see, our goals, our expectations, and an affirmation of the flexibility of procedures for attaining them. We must, for unless we find a way now to clarify our purposes, we will deprive children of a rightful heritage: the opportunity to explore through contrast the use and meaning of language.

REACTION TO: WHY? WHAT? HOW?
by Melba D. Woodruff

Robert Brooks
Cleveland Public Schools

Dr. Woodruff has given a great deal of thought to the problems faced by FLES teachers in America. She has assessed the needs of the profession and has chosen two lacunae which, she feels, must be filled before FLES can build and grow on a solid foundation. She is appealing to the large professional organizations to accept the challenge, and to publish 1) minimal objectives, and 2) units of interdisciplinary materials. She evidently feels that the organizations possess the human resources needed to accomplish these tasks, and also the prestige necessary to command the respect of decision-makers throughout the nation. She hopes that eventually, the national attitude toward communication might change.

I have been asked to react to Dr. Woodruff's proposal. I myself am surprised at the difficulty I experience in complying with this request. Perhaps it is because I feel that such a rational proposal deserves a

rational reaction, and yet my very long and deep involvement with FLES elicits highly emotional responses. I would like to come up with some straight-forward conclusions. I would like to say, "Yes, we should do this, because...." or, "No, we should not do that, because..." Unfortunately, I do not have any answers--only questions. But perhaps serious consideration of these questions will lend a new dimension to Dr. Woodruff's proposals, and will help those with whom final decisions rest, to choose the path that our organization would like to follow.

There is no doubt in my mind that the publications which Dr. Woodruff is proposing would be sensible and logical ones for FLES educators to have access to. Surely, no harm could come of them, and they have a potential for doing a great deal of good, provided that they are wisely and consistently used. Some questions do, however, come to mind:

1. Would these two proposals really satisfy the most basic needs of the profession? If not, how can the most basic needs best be identified? Would it be wiser to concentrate on just one need at this time? Or would it be wiser to address ourselves to more than two?

2. Are our professional organizations the ones who are best equipped to deal with the proposals? What success have ACTFL and the AATG experienced with minimal objectives? How have the MLA FLES curricula fared? How influential have the publications of the AATF FLES committee <u>really</u> been over the past two decades?

3. Whom would these new publications be expected to influence? FLES teachers? Elementary principals? Superintendents in charge of curriculum? Local boards of education? PTA members? Tax-payers? Schools of education? State boards of education?

It would be sad indeed to have some of the finest minds in the profession spend years of their time, great quantities of their energy and creativity, on projects which, in spite of their obvious quality, were doomed to gather dust on library shelves because the fashion had changed, or because they were not designed to be read by the people who possess the power to make changes.

Above all, Dr. Woodruff is asking our professional organizations to develop and deliver clout. She has very wisely observed elsewhere that unless we FLES teachers exert our own influence, others will make decisions for us which will not be to our liking. I therefore believe it to be pertinent that, while we are asking questions about her proposals, we also examine the phenomenon of clout and try to determine why we language teachers have had so little of it in the past.

Please be forewarned that the opinions I am about to express have been labeled cynical and pessimistic by those who have already heard them. As for me, I believe them to be only realistic, and I feel that all the unfulfilled golden promises of the '50s and '60s attest to this realism. I believe that the situations to which I

am about to refer must be dealt with directly by anyone who would wish to have clout in the field of education. I also believe that because we educators find these situations distasteful, and therefore choose not to deal with them, we have traditionally had very little clout indeed.

American education is clouded and befogged by an astonishing number of myths. Americans in general, and educators in particular, cling to these myths because, without them, their lives might seem pointless and ugly. Here are some myths which I believe to pertain especially to us language teachers:

Myth #1 Public education is concerned with teaching, learning, growth and development of children. Fact #1: These may sometimes be accidental by-products. Actually, when important decisions are being made, money is probably the greatest concern, and personal glory or professional promotion probably run a close second.

Myth #2 Research conducted in schools of education at large universities advances pedagogical causes. Fact #2: If this were true, then diplomas and degrees would be worth much more now, after 75 years of research, than they were in 1900. Instead, they are all greatly devalued. Let us ask ourselves then: who really profits from the pedagogical research conducted in the universities?

Myth #3 The number of FLES programs in existence, or the number of students enrolled in them, is an indication of public interest in second language learning. Fact #3: What the public is really interested in is day-care. As long as the child is in school all day, and not repeating, most parents are content.

What he learns, or whether he learns at all, are not areas of great concern. Administrators know this and behave accordingly. FLES may be tolerated for its snob-appeal, or perhaps for the advancement of those who are running the program.

Myth #4 Commercially-developed materials advance pedagogical causes. Fact #4: Publishers are in business to make money. They will cheerfully compromise any pedagogical principal to increase sales.

Myth #5 Interdisciplinary fusion is good for FLES. Fact #5: Every time I have seen it practiced, it is always the other discipline which is enriched, and FLES which is impoverished. If matters are allowed to continue their natural trend, then FLES will eventually disappear altogether.

Myth #6 Professional organizations really care about FLES and really have the power to support it. Fact #6: Professional organizations care about what the majority cares about, and FLES teachers represent a very tiny minority--much disdained by teachers at other levels. And as for power, if professional organizations had any power at all, secondary and college levels of instruction would not be in the shape they are in today.

Myth #7 Only if children like an activity can it be pedagogically valuable and sound. Fact #7: Learning often hurts. Do you have to love falling off bikes to learn to ride one? Must you be enthralled by ripping out stitches in order to learn to knit?

The real world of education is not, as we would like to believe, all about teaching and learning. It is about money, scheduling, bussing, pupil-teacher ratios, and social welfare work. If we wish to have a real influence on real people--if we wish to introduce an element of teaching-and-learning into this real world, then we must

develop our proposals and choose our committees with such things as money, scheduling, bussing, pupil-teacher ratios, and social welfare work very much in mind. Perhaps an illustration will make this clearer:

Committee A of the imaginary National Council of Foreign Language Teachers prepares and distributes to the superintendents of 100 American school systems an attractive brochure, proposing the inclusion of Arabic in every one of their elementary schools. Mention is made of the importance of this language in an oil-starved world, of the cultural contributions of the Arab peoples in the domains of poetry, art, mathematics and medicine, and of the deep insights that a study of Arabic can give young children into their own language and their own culture.

Committee B of the NCFLT prepares and distributes to the same superintendents an attractive brochure, proposing the inclusion of Arabic into every one of their elementary schools. Mention is made that by scheduling lessons during breakfast, recess, and lunch time, classroom teachers can be relieved of a share of their heavy responsibilities--an item which the teachers' union has been pushing hard for in negotiating sessions. At the same time, the teacher-pupil ratio can be drastically cut, thus providing a pat answer to the union, which is also demanding smaller classes. The FLES program would

cost nothing, because teachers' salaries would be paid for out of the federally-funded breakfast and lunch programs, and with careful management, there would be enough money left over for some much-needed resurfacing of parking lots. Since the native speakers of Arabic are frequently dark-skinned Moslems, the expense of bussing could also be averted.

Which of the two attractive brochures is likely to find itself in the wastebasket of the superintendent's secretary? Which of the two committees is likely to receive a letter from the superintendent, asking for further information?

In reacting to Dr. Woodruff's proposals, I have raised many questions. Some deal with FLES's basic needs. Some deal with the ability of our professional organizations to influence what goes on in the classroom, and some deal with the nature of the public which we are trying to reach. Along the way, I have cautioned against falling into some of the traps which our educational mythology has set to engulf us and to make our efforts meaningless. I hope that both the questions and the words of caution will help our decision-makers determine a wise course of action on Dr. Woodruff's proposal.

There is another a phenomenon which might well be described, and which is a disappointment to me: the posture which our professional organizations have assumed

in regard to languages in general and FLES in particular. For the past 20 years, all of our professional organizations have presented themselves to us as having a great influence upon the profession. At conventions, there reigns an atmosphere of enthusiasm similar to that of a political convention. Platforms are constructed and endorsed. A stranger would assume, from attending our meetings or from reading our journals, that tremendous strides are being made. In the '50s, we achieved universal adoption of an audio-lingual approach, thus ending forever the reign of tyranny we endured under the grammar-translation method. In the '60s we established firmly the long sequence, K-12. By the '70s, therefore, we could devote our energies to the luxury of interdisciplinary experiments with language arts, social studies, math and science. To listen to us, one would believe that we have brought up a whole generation of bilingual adults who are now demanding better foreign language instruction for their children before the '80s. The truth is that our organizations were neither committed enough nor powerful enough to achieve a single one of these goals, and, like the fox in the fable, have justified abandoning one for another by claiming that the former was no longer desirable, and that the latter held greater promise. This politic has led us to the extremely undesirable position we now occupy. If it is being cynical

to tell it like it is, then I am cynical. But doesn't SOMEBODY have to tell the Emperor that he has no clothes on before he catches pneumonia?

PRESCRIPTION FOR FLES: POSITIVE ACTION

Virginia Gramer
Hinsdale Public Schools
Hinsdale, Illinois

It has been proposed that FLES programs throughout the nation would be supported, strengthened and implemented by the development of a set of specific behavioral objectives, and the subsequent development of relevant materials which would reflect them. That the development of the objectives by a national committee would be beneficial in many ways, is beyond question. A number of school districts have felt such a need and have created their own lists. Specific instructional or behavioral objectives are included in the banks of objectives available from repositories and universities. To edit or to organize these into a set of behavioral objectives which would be nationally acceptable would certainly serve to stabilize current FLES offerings and would tend to upgrade some of them. That just the existence of such a set of objectives, or even a universal committment to them by foreign language teachers is going to solve some very basic problems or even to ease our way, is not so certain.

Foreign language has probably weathered no more highs or lows than other elementary school curricular areas. Our lows, however, are critical, since oblivion yawns one step below. That which distinguishes foreign language from other subjects, that which places it in constant jeopardy, is its position as a non-essential program, non-essential by law and by attitude.

WHOM DO WE CONVINCE AND HOW?

"We never really saw the earth we live on until we left it. Just as we needed a foothold in space from which to view our world, so we need to swing free on another language. We cannot assess the dimensions of our own language until we are given an opportunity to view it from a removed vantage point."

Is this the prime reason for studying a foreign language? Probably not. It is a magnificent fringe benefit, yet foreign language teachers, especially FLES teachers feel continually pressed to promote the value of learning or perhaps, more accurately, of studying a foreign language on such bases. In rationalizing the inclusion of our subject in the elementary school, we foreign language teachers consistently marshall such arguments because we know that many of those which whom we deal outside of our own discipline, those who wield power over the survival of foreign language in the curriculum, truly see no important, high priority reason for

knowing a second language, possibly because many of them have never been exposed to one.

A massive national campaign by a coalition of all foreign language organizations, directed with missionary zeal to the conversion of the public from its current state of apathy toward foreign language learning, would probably result in solutions for many problems of foreign language programs at all levels. For whatever incredible reasons, this campaign does not seem imminent. So each foreign language teacher, at each level, in every geographical area must continue to battle in isolation for the acceptance of foreign language study as a future career booster as well as for the many direct and indirect benefits it provides to each student.

For those in the elementary school the battle is focused on assuring the continuing existence of current FLES programs, upgrading the quality of current programs and promoting the proliferation of new FLES programs. (The prognosis for an outbreak of new programs is a negative one unless there is some tremendous upswing in the financial status of public school systems as well as in their conviction that foreign language is a necessity in a total curriculum.)

The first priority, maintaining programs now in existence, appears to be treadmill of constant justification. No matter how well articulated a FLES program is or how successful its product is deemed, we must be very realistic

about the foundations of its stability. Its continued existence is primarily a financial matter. Foreign language teachers are competing for funds with those in other disciplines whose rationale for the continuation of their programs and whose commitment to the value of their subject are just as firm as our own. We are in the position of selling our product to:

1. administrators and boards of education;
2. students; and
3. parents.

The multiplicity of values which we, as teachers, see in the skills and attitudes which are part of learning another language need to be translated in terms of the value system of each group. Trying to convince a nine-year-old that he should value his FLES class because of the rewards he will reap from this experience in ten to twelve years is no more efficacious than presenting to a board of education, as the justification for money spent on a program, the opinion that children can find great joy and satisfaction in learning another language.

ADMINISTRATORS, BOARDS, PARENTS

With administrators and boards the problem is dual--1) convincing them of the rewards and the values of competency in a foreign language; and 2) the justification for its inclusion as an elementary school subject. Since foreign

language teachers often feel defeated on score 1, of convincing boards and administrators of the basic values of knowing a second language, they tend to cite the values of studying a second language--that it upgrades certain mental facilities, divergent thinking; that it maintains audio-lingual skills which would atrophy if left unused until adolescence; that it tends to provide a frame of reference from which to view English, etc.

However, an enumeration of what administrators consider side effects is not an effective defense weapon against budgetary assault. Quantification of content, the proof of the pudding, whether or not we agree with the concept, provides the basis for acceptance of and the value placed on most subject areas by administrators and boards. How do other curricular areas claim some objective measure of achievement which would prove the efficacy of their programs? Tests. Standardized, nationally normed tests. That standardized tests such as exist for basic elementary school curricular areas would upgrade the quality of FLES offerings, is questionable; but properly designed foreign language tests, if included in elementary school test batteries, would confer upon FLES programs a certain legitimacy, an established and accepted inclusion in the elementary school curriculum which is not now universally enjoyed. They would provide the kind of objective proof of accomplishment sought by most administrators and boards of education.

Such a test would also serve to support the establishment of minimal objectives, since these would, of necessity, form the base on which the test would be constructed. But who would set the minimal objectives? Textbook publishers, test manufacturers or a committee of FLES specialists (as suggested by Melba Woodruff). Such a committee would need to be composed of those working directly with children in elementary schools as well as supervisors and linguists. Goals need to be formed by those who are knowledgeable about what children are capable of accomplishing, in order to obviate the dangers inherent in such a testing instrument and to avoid the flaws of those now in use.

Tests for elementary school foreign language students tend to rise or fall on the basis of vocabulary, a fact generally ignored by the test manufacturers (including some pedagogs). Because of his limited vocabulary, one or two unfamiliar words can render inoperable a multiplicity of structures a FLES student is ordinarily capable of manipulating and using freely within his limited choice of words. Formation of objectives and consequently of tests will not result in valid national guidelines unless the limiting effect of vocabulary is recognized.

Any section on the affective domain, difficult to assess under ideal circumstances, must be cautiously plotted, since it is in the area of attitudes and cultural

enrichment that some FLES goals are now rather extravagantly stated. To proclaim that a FLES class is going to provide a child with a "significant" experience in another culture is as unrealistic a projection as that statement which proved the undoing of many "pie in the sky" FLES programs of the 60's, "The goal of the FLES program is to make the child bi-lingual". In the artificial environment of the classroom, albeit aided by films, slides and native speakers, we can only provide a child with glimpses of the way in which the people of another culture conduct themselves. What we can realistically aim for is removing a child's attitudinal blinders which cause him to consider the American version of English (and those who are native speakers of it) as the norm, and all that deviates from it (or from them) as "funny" or "queer".

If we propose the establishment of minimal behavioral objectives for all FLES students in the nation, then an assessment of the achievement of these objectives is a legitimate and logical conclusion and not an unreasonable expectation of administrators and boards of education. If such evaluative instruments can be designed to be valid measures of achievement and are effective in determining desired proof of accomplishment, then it should be foreign language teachers who instigate such test development.

STUDENTS AND PARENTS

Let us now come to the focus of it all, student attitude and performance. We talk a great deal about communication. Our goal is alerting students to the benefits of communicating in another language, to impart to children the joy of communicating in another way. Indeed, nine and ten year olds really would enjoy an alternate vehicle of communication. But have we provided them with a second system of communication or just with a system of signals used to convey answers to a teacher who poses her questions in the same code? Do we teach them what they want to say? "What time is it?" "What color is it?" "What's the date?" Is that the kind of information elementary children are anxious to exchange?

Just as we must be very practical about the kind of evidence of foreign language achievement valued by administrators, we must be very realistic about children's needs and values in second language learning. We need to identify and accept as important the content of children's communications with one another. If we are going to develop relevant materials based on those nationally produced behavioral objectives, then we must decide, first of all, relevant to whom. Much concern has been directed toward breaking down the language into its easily teachable component parts with relatively little research on the message content of children's language. Unit or structural organization of content need not be drastically altered but just adjusted to fit what elementary

school children need or want to say:

1- at home;

2- to their teachers; and

3- to one another (often derogatory. How many courses contain acceptable but effective "put downs").

A student who is able and anxious to use outside of the classroom, what he has learned within it, cannot consider the classroom experience as irrelevant. The student who is enthusiastic, involved, and convinced of the worth of the offering will almost certainly win, for the program, parental approbation.

GOALS ⟶ ACTION

Five years ago, in New Orleans, the National FLES Committee of the American Association of Teachers of French presented a report, FLES: Patterns for Change. From a chapter on goals for FLES:

> ... Concern (in the formation of FLES goals) has traditionally been on the proper development of foreign language skills, with vertical articulation with the succeeding level one of the prime objectives. Now of the highest priority is the formation of goals, is the position and fit of FLES in the elementary school.... The FLES teacher must develop the objectives and goals for her own discipline but the strategies used to achieve these goals must be compatible with the organization and the goals of the elementary school which is their setting.... Realistic, realizable, affective and cognitive goals may be the key to the survival and strengthening of foreign language in the elementary school. May we start with these:

1-To determine what we are trying to do in FLES, to set realistic, definite, realizable goals for achievement.

2-To provide, within any organizational framework, successful foreign language experiences for each student.

3-To aim for quality; to make each child's FLES experience, no matter how limited, something of value.

4-To promote FLES as an integral part of the elementary school by sharing resources, research, responsibility, and organizational patterns.

5-To enter into a partnership with elementary teachers to achieve the goals for the total education of the child.

Our goal for any FLES student is that he will leave the program with quality experiences in terms of foreign language skills achieved at his own level of competence, with positive attitudes toward foreign language based on success and enjoyment, and with some appreciation and understanding of a culture other than his own.[1]

Though the goals of five years ago still seem valid, today we need much more than just a statement of intent. We have proclaimed our dogma; now we must commit ourselves

---

[1]Virginia Gramer, "Innovations, the Changing Goals of Education and FLES," FLES: Patterns for Change, Gladys Lipton, Virginia Spaar-Rauch, editors (FLES Committee of American Association of Teachers of French, 1970), pp. 28, 30, 46.

to convert, to proselytize. FLES teachers, in concert, must take immediate, constructive action to achieve:

1- a positive climate, nationwide, for foreign language instruction at all levels;

2- sets of national standards to stabilize the quality of FLES programs, and valid evaluation instruments to determine the realization of FLES objectives; and

3- the general acceptance of foreign language as a standard elementary school curricular area.

Each FLES teacher in her own school, in her own district, must strive:

1- to be an integral part of the elementary school in which she teaches;

2- to achieve, for her subject, the status and regularity accorded to other curricular areas; and

3- to make foreign language a functioning part of the whole school fabric by

   a- reinforcing other subject areas and by being supported by them; and

   b- adhering to the same philosophy of instruction as other curricular areas.

4- To make her offering an effective link in a longer foreign language sequence, working continually for perfect articulation at each level; and

5- to provide a profitable, enjoyable, logical portion of a child's day.

THREE MYTHS THAT ALMOST KILLED FLES

P. Paul Parent
Purdue University

Americans love success. When Sputnik demonstrated that we were second in space, we became concerned about the quality of our educational system. We promised ourselves to enrich the school curriculum through NDEA so that our children would become first in math and science. So it was inevitable that we should also attempt to be first in learning modern foreign languages.

It was not long before FLES proponents guaranteed success to those children who would begin foreign language study at the elementary school level. Three ideas to ensure this achievement became popular, and, eventually, these ideas became pedagogical law, despite the fact that they failed to prove their value in actual practice. In fact, they had become myths - the three myths that almost killed FLES.

James B. Conant[1] advised us that we should strive toward mastery in one foreign language rather than partial

---

[1]James B. Conant, The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

accomplishments in several. Other experts told us that the mastery of a foreign language didn't materialize in a two-year high school sequence and suggested that we start earlier, as the Europeans do.

These comments precipitated a drive to internalize basic structures at the lower level. Elementary foreign language teachers were told to place learning of structures before vocabulary building. Listening and speaking being primarily the functional use of structures, vocabulary could come later to substitute within those structures.

We sold this myth of mastery to parents who were only too glad to know that their children would be able to interpret for them on their next trip to Quebec. We inundated their children with expansion drills, substitution drills, memorized dialogues, etc., in imitation of high school foreign language classes. Unfortunately, when these children were given a choice about continuing foreign language study at the junior high level, they opted out. They hadn't achieved mastery. Moreover, their excitement about learning the foreign language had been exhausted.

Of course a few of these pupils did survive, and every now and then one filters into our college foreign language programs. What is also true, in almost every case, is that the FLES program where they started is now dead.

The impetus for FLES naturally came from those who were already involved in teaching foreign languages in high schools and universities. Foreign language pedagogues were so intent upon mastery that our first concern in establishing any FLES program was continuity. We could not conceive of a FLES experience that would end after one or two years; the program was to continue into the junior and senior high. As a matter of fact, we suggested that a junior high program feeding into the senior high should be well established before initiating FLES. There were to be no gaps in instruction once the pupil had entered the sequence.

The concept of the spiral curriculum imbued us with enthusiasm to do the groundwork at the elementary school level. Once the structures were in place we thought, we would have another 6 years through grades 7-12 to complete the edifice. Experience has shown us, however, that follow-up in foreign language study is not always possible or desirable for any number of reasons. Unfortunately, we have considered our inability to implement the ideal long sequence as a disaster. This was a reasonable reaction, given the intensity of our efforts to maintain the myth of continuity.

Perhaps our most grievous fault in implementing FLES in the 1960's was to isolate ourselves from the total

elementary curriculum. Despite the caveats of such reports as that of the 1966 AATF FLES Committee, we perpetuated the myth that foreign language specialists were indispensable to the success of a FLES program. We focused so intently on linguistic objectives that we neglected to consider the role of the regular fourth grade teacher in our program. Indeed, the itinerant FLES "expert" was so busy shuttling between all the schools in the district that she didn't have time to say much of anything to the regular fourth grade teacher.

The point is that the foreign language specialists who endorsed FLES generally lacked a realistic understanding of the elementary school curriculum. With our overwhelming concern for mastery, we often remained insensitive to the psychological and educational needs of children. In a word, we intruded into the elementary school curriculum by insisting on the uniqueness of our subject. We did not sit long enough with elementary school teachers and consultants to listen to their story, so eager were we to tell them how their children should be taught foreign languages and what these pupils had been missing by not learning a foreign language at an early age.

The three myths of mastery, continuity, and specialization have tended to keep FLES in the hands of the foreign

language experts who encouraged this curriculum development in the 1960's. Sad to say, that is where FLES is right now: back in the hands and on the drawing boards of the ivory-towered specialists, and not in the warp and woof of the elementary school curriculum.

The problem, as we have tried to explain, perhaps lies to a large extent in the fact that we viewed curriculum in a vertical dimension, from FLES to Level VI (high school senior). I propose that a horizontal approach to the curriculum would have put FLES where it belongs, as a concomitant experience for the child simultaneously learning language arts, social studies, and the like. In other words, we thrust FLES out of the habitat we had sought for it by insisting on linguistic perfection and overlooking the saturation levels of the child. We contained it in a 20 minute segment of the school day under a specialist, when we should not have ignored and distrusted the regular teacher's interest in spreading it out throughout the day.

Perhaps what is really happening is that we've reached a new situation in the seventies. With all our NDEA experience of the 1960's behind us and with our recognition of the present educational trend toward pluralistic values, individualization, and a freer approach to the curriculum, we who hope for the growth of FLES programs have no choice but to make FLES responsive to the interests and needs of children today.

For instance, now that we have the advantage of hindsight, it is obvious that we ignored a vital psychological principle of children: their love for variety and experimentation. Suppose that a group of children has reached a level of saturation after two years of the study of French in grades 5 and 6. Why shouldn't they be allowed to take Spanish in grade 7 -- or drop foreign language altogether until grade 10? Why should we become so frustrated if they choose the latter option? We ought to recognize that children's reflections about choice of language and their intensity of commitment to its study become more mature as their general educational goals become clearer. If a student's first contact with a foreign language resulted in the development of a positive attitude toward it, we can expect a highly motivated student when his second contact comes around.

Our ideas about the qualifications of those who teach FLES must also change. Some states permit teachers with a high school certificate to teach at lower levels, including FLES. While this certification law might appeal to us as experts who want other experts like ourselves before any foreign language class -- FLES included, it is not the best way to integrate FLES into the curriculum. For the future growth of FLES, we will have to substitute a certain measure of language proficiency for a first-hand experience with the total elementary school curriculum.

While it is true that some high school teachers have been successful in shedding a "College Board -- mastery" approach to foreign language study in order to provide an appropriate learning experience for elementary school pupils, the outlook, methods, and objectives between the two levels are so vastly different that it is unrealistic to expect most experienced upper-level teachers to be able to make that intellectual and psychological transfer. We should recognize that our overinsistence on accuracy of pronunciation, correctness of grammar, and fluency of the teacher in the 1960's has inhibited many a potential FLES teacher, already on the scene, from attempting projects of this type. The high school teacher who was schooled in such principles of perfection through an NDEA institute or two may as well relax now and encourage good-will and enthusiasm where it may still be found. Let us remember that the Pennsylvania Study[2] showed no correlation between teacher language proficiency and student performance. Indeed, our experience tells us that a fluent teacher often takes too much for granted, whereas a teacher who

---

[2]Philip D. Smith, A Comparison of the Cognitive and Audiolingual Approaches to Foreign Language Instruction. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1970.

has struggled and is still struggling to learn the language often has greater sensitivity with the student who doesn't find language learning an easy task.

There is no question but that there are many elementary grade teachers ready to develop such an area of interest; all they lack, for the most part, is encouragement from a high school foreign language teacher. Here are some of the ways that the high school specialist could help in the new order of things.

1. Solicit the approval and cooperation of the superintendent of schools and/or principals in the feeder elementary schools. Their support will make it easier to identify one or more elementary grade teachers with a foreign language background.

2. Help the FLES teacher formulate objectives and evaluate progress toward those goals.

3. Assist the FLES teacher in planning activities, perhaps suggesting a song, source of materials, realia, etc. The interested grade teacher will surely have ideas and contacts of her own. The high school teacher would serve as a catalyst to get the project underway.

4. Assist the FLES teacher with such technical matters as pronunciation, although we should probably be more tolerant in this area than we were in the 1960's.

Since the early days of NDEA, Purdue University has been committed to FLES teacher training. We at Purdue continue in that commitment with students currently enrolled in our FLES methods course. The graduates of our program are all certified elementary school teachers,

first and foremost. To their elementary school teaching certificate, they add a FLES endorsement consisting of 24 credits in a foreign language, plus a course in FLES methodology. This methods course is not confined to classroom theory, and we have been fortunate in obtaining the cooperation of surrounding school districts in providing a lab situation for our students.

This lab experience has been most successful for our students who bring to the classroom an awareness of the broader needs of their pupils, thanks to their methodology courses in math, science, language arts, music/art, plus courses in the elementary school curriculum, child psychology, etc. Occasionally the program enjoys the participation of elementary education majors who return from one of Purdue's Academic Year Abroad Programs. Last year, for example, two FLES methods students returned from a year in Madrid. Other students may appear after spending a summer in Mexico or France.

We do not promise these students jobs in FLES as they graduate, but appeal to them to make their interest in foreign language study a complement to their general interest in the elementary school child. We tell them that, hopefully, they will be able to integrate some foreign language study into their curriculum when they are hired to teach a regular fourth grade, for example,

In some cases, this FLES endorsement has made the difference in a competitive job market, and a number of our former students actually find themselves in positions where they teach their foreign language in addition to other elementary grade subjects. This also enables them to review foreign language proficiencies during the social studies or math class, for instance.

With the growth of interest in bilingualism, we have also appealed to students on this basis. A grade-school teacher with a background in Spanish can become an indispensable asset in a community whose number of Spanish-speaking residents is increasing. The FLES endorsement clearly indicates the candidate's interest and preparation to the hiring superintendent.

The Purdue FLES teacher training program is committed to the proposition that the mistakes of the past need not be repeated. As our profession sheds the rigidities of our earlier attempts, let us now look positively to a new dimension for FLES in the years ahead.

FLES CAN BE _____*

*(You Fill in the Blank!)

Gladys C. Lipton
Bureau of Foreign Languages
New York City Schools

FLES can be_____: a) beautiful; b) all things for all pupils; c) excitingly different; d) an exploratory course in language; e) a solid, fundamental course in language study which leads to higher levels; f) an integral part of a well-planned bilingual program; g) a well-coordinated TV/classroom teacher approach; h) inexpensive; i) an opportunity to enhance the self-image of native speakers of the foreign language; j) a failure if too much is promised for a limited program; k) a success...

It is true that there seems to be renewed interest in foreign language in the elementary school--not necessarily what had been stereotyped as FLES in the past. Whether people are talking about bilingual programs, early childhood education, or exploratory language, there seems to be a drive and a desire on the part of parents to pressure administrators to institute language programs, particularly in the large cities. Along with

this trend, however, is a rather sobering trend toward "the basics", and this trend is likely to become entrenched for many years.

Enthusiasts of the past have made pronouncements which, in the light of today's budgetary crises, seem impossible to implement. In this writer's opinion, therefore, the keyword for FLES programs in the future is FLEXIBILITY, not conformity, nor a national statement on the nature of FLES. I believe that this was our mistake the first time around. Flexibility should be our motto, to the extent that any exposure to foreign language in the elementary school grades should be admitted to the "FLES Club". If we all can agree that children should not be deprived of a foreign language experience, all kinds of sequences, all kinds of objectives, all kinds of materials, methods, equipment, etc. can co-exist. If we put ourselves into a straight-jacket of national objectives and national procedures, we may not be able to salvage even the successful programs which have survived the recent cutbacks. Agreed--we may all wish to strive for 9-and 12-year foreign language sequences, but the realities of the budgetary exigencies may call for only one year. I for one am willing to say that even a microscopic experience is superior to no experience at all!

What does FLES need?

1. A great variety of alternative approaches (similar to the a to k) choices listed at the beginning of this article.

2. A list of FLES courses of study throughout the country, so that school systems need not duplicate efforts.

3. The development of courses of study in the so-called difficult languages, for if ever there was a justification for long sequences, it is in the study of such languages as Japanese, Russian, Arabic, Chinese...

4. Another look at previously developed materials, such as the MLA materials, TV, films and film-strips.

5. We need the continuous listing and descriptions of on-going, successful (how do we determine this?) programs for morale purposes, and for indicating to administrators and parents that an early introduction of foreign languages is one of "the basics".

6. We need a national SPEAKERS' BUREAU where effective speakers may be on call for individual schools, districts, community and parent groups, etc. These speakers can offer a number of options to each community, based on the interest, funding, personnel, and ethnic make-up of the community.

7. We need to work with bilingual centers to build cooperation on what should be a joint venture, both in materials/sharing and methods/exchanging.

8. We need to learn more about the organization of the elementary schools across the country. They vary from community to community--and therefore FLES needs to vary from community to community. What we need is an individualized approach to FLES planning.

9. We need to lean heavily on the knowledge acquired by anthropologists on identifying important elements of other cultures. We can barely describe our own culture. Let us try to find out how to describe other cultures. We may mouth the glorious statements that language is culture, but can we really get this across to young students without having them memorize a list of unrelated facts?

FLES can be_____. How are <u>you</u> going to fill in the blank?

FLES SUPPORTS BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND VICE VERSA IN THE LOUISIANA EXPERIMENT

Homer B. Dyess, Coordinator
Foreign Languages and
Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Louisiana State Department of Education

As we entered the 70's, the future of FLES, and indeed, all foreign language study in Louisiana was both doubtful and grim. The most impressive FLES program in the state, the "Parlons Français" program in the Orleans Parish Public Schools, which had begun so auspiciously in 1960 in some 108 elementary schools, had dwindled to only a few schools whose principals and classroom teachers held tenaciously to the program in grades four through six. Elsewhere in the state, secondary programs were disappearing as our colleges and universities dropped foreign language requirements for more and more courses of study.

In 1968, the newly formed Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL) had passed impressive legislation in an attempt to preserve the existing French language and culture, but this permissive legislation in an attempt to preserve the existing French

language and culture, but this permissive legislation allowed local school systems to "opt out" of initiating programs in the elementary schools, and they did, almost unanimously.

The Foreign Language Section of the State Department of Education, working closely with CODOFIL, surveyed the state to identify the problems to be dealt with in initiating FLES programs that would articulate with and enhance secondary foreign language programs.

It was found that the status of elementary foreign language study was practically nil, even though one-third of the parishes (counties) of the state were classified as French-speaking by the Louisiana legislature in the area designated officially as Acadiana. On a priority basis, FLES was invariably last on any list of elementary school subjects, if considered at all.

In truth, the arguments offered by local school administrators against FLES had merit. The NDEA and EPDA programs for foreign languages were gone and forgotten and even though Russia had launched "Sputnik," America had succeeded in putting a man on the moon. School administrators who had followed the trend of NDEA had purchased extensive hardware, including sophisticated language laboratories, which they found were being used rarely, if ever, and considered themselves burned.

The state as a whole lacked several components necessary to maintain lasting FLES programs.

First, there was a lack of trained teachers to provide FLES instruction in the elementary grades, as Louisiana had no teacher training programs for this level (even though Act 257 of the 1968 legislature mandated that such programs be offered by the colleges and universities of the state).

Secondly, there was a lack of "teachable" materials for the primary and upper elementary grades, even though publishers claimed that their foreign language materials could be used at any beginning level.

Third, there was a lack of interest on the part of practically everyone who held the decision-making power to initiate FLES programs in the elementary schools. To be fair, this lack of interest was coupled with their inability to see any practical use for foreign or second language study when the public schools of the South were grappling with continually changing federal guidelines designed to "ease" racial and social tensions as the tidal wave of integration broke over the "status quo" policies that had guided educational institutions for generations.

Finally, there was also a lack of local funds. As a valid FLES program costs money to establish, many school systems, struggling to make ends meet with

existing priorities, considered it an impossible task to justify additional expenses to the local school boards.

Then events began to occur on the national level which would have positive and, hopefully, lasting effects on the future of FLES. In 1970, two Louisiana school systems with a high concentration of French-dominant students applied for ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Programs and were approved for funding.

Mr. James Domengeaux, the Chairman of CODOFIL, had only recently met in Paris with French President Pompidou, and as a result, had initiated a program whereby qualified teachers from France would come to Louisiana to help initiate FLES programs at minimal cost, utilizing elementary curriculum material (Frere Jacques) supplied by the French government. To meet the staffing needs of the two new ESEA Title VII programs, CODOFIL supplied a number of the French Associate Teachers. These young, native-speaking teachers worked with the local program staff members of the two projects to develop curriculum materials for kindergarten through grade six. This had important implications for FLES, as the French spoken by the French dominant children was an oral French - a mixture of Cajun and Creole dialects - and therefore, French as a standard dialect was the basis for curriculum development.

The fact that the federally funded bilingual programs mandated teacher-training meant that the university serving these two projects was faced with the necessity of developing a program that would not only train, but also certify teachers at the elementary level. Three other state universities joined in to develop this in-service teacher-training program in conjunction with the Foreign Language Section of the State Department of Education. Through these joint efforts, the Second Language Specialist Teacher-Training Program (SLS) emerged as a competency-based program of twenty-four hours that would give licensed elementary classroom teachers, as well as licensed secondary foreign language teachers, additional certification. To this was added the incentive of a pay increment equal to eighty percent of the next higher degree pay scale. It took three years to develop this program and to have it approved by the task force on teacher certification, the State Board of Education and the legislature. The program is now offered by eight Louisiana universities and will be available in seven more by 1976-77.

Another important event was the advent of career education. Louisiana became, under the administration of the present chief state school officer, Louis J. Michot, the first state to incorporate career education

in the total school curriculum, kindergarten through post-secondary education. This move necessitated new curriculum guides for every subject matter area and the Foreign Language Section, with a thirty member curriculum coordinating council for foreign languages, developed career-oriented curriculum guides K-12, for French, Spanish, German, Russian and Latin. Thus, career education gave foreign language instruction and bilingual education a "raison d'etre" and simultaneously a boost in status in the total school curriculum. As proof of this, the revised Administrators' Handbook, Bulletin 741 of the State Department of Education, carries as a part of the program of study for elementary schools the following statement: "Foreign or second languages may be taught in the elementary grades one through eight as either language arts or enrichment." This addition carried weight, as eventually three new French bilingual programs were funded, as were Spanish and Italian bilingual programs. These seven programs were funded under ESEA Title VII, wherein all elementary school subjects are taught in both languages. As of FY 1975, Louisiana has a total of twelve federally funded bilingual programs; four French/English programs, two Spanish/English programs, and one Italian/English program funded under ESEA, Title VII.

In 1972, with funding from the legislation and the State Department of Education amounting to $500,000, the CODOFIL French Program was begun as a state-wide pilot program. This program utilized one-hundred foreign associate teachers teaching 16,500 pupils in grades one through three in eighty-eight elementary schools of twenty parishes. The program differed from traditional FLES programs in that one full hour per day was devoted to French in each class, with half an hour in French language arts and one-half hour in such areas as art, music, math or physical education in French.

By the 1974-75 school year, the program had expanded to 232 French Associate Teachers from France, Belgium and Quebec, teaching approximately 40,000 children in thirty-six parishes. The program budget had also expanded to $1,300,000. This year, 1975-76, eighty-eight Louisiana teachers were certified as Second Language Specialists. This allowed the CODOFIL Program to reduce the foreign associate teachers to 210, and there are 180 Louisiana teachers projected to complete the Second Language Specialist Program by the summer of 1975.

In order to assist the Louisiana teachers newly certified as Second Language Specialists, it was decided to take advantage of the newly created Louisiana Educational Television Authority (LETA) to revive "Parlons

Francais," as Louisiana held the rights to broadcast this very effective program. Although slightly dated in format, this program is still considered linguistically sound and the best program for French instruction via television that America has to offer. In the six parishes where Louisiana teachers are utilizing "Parlons Francais," trained foreign resource teachers are assigned on a basis of one to six SLS teachers. These native-speaking resource teachers have proved invaluable in assisting the SLS teachers to make the transition and to take over the job of teaching French as a second language in the elementary grades.

Also in 1974, there was increased federal funding for bilingual education, as the nation became more and more aware of the rights of ethnic minority groups. The Lau-Nichols decision and the subsequent interest shown by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights prompted many states to enact laws concerning bilingual/bicultural education.

In the summer of 1975, the Louisiana legislature passed, with only one dissenting vote, Act 714, which authorizes all public school systems in the state to initiate second language programs for school year 1976-77. These programs to begin in grade one and to expand upwards each year to grade twelve. If by May 30, 1976,

such programs have not been voluntarily initiated, then parents of any school may petition for instruction in a particular second language. Upon presentation of a petition signed by twenty-five percent of the parents of a particular school, the local school board must provide a program in that second language.

With a competency-based teacher-training program leading to extended certification and a pay increment, with the continued assistance of the Foreign Associate Teachers from both French and Spanish-speaking countries until an adequate number of Louisiana teachers are trained, with curriculum materials developed in Louisiana for Louisiana children, with a renewed interest in "Parlons Francais" and with an additional television series, "Jolie Louisiane," developed by the Louisiana Education Television Authority, it is felt that FLES and bilingual/bicultural education in Louisiana will be mutually supportive and that both have every assurance of continued growth and development for the future.

COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

(One year's experience in Evangeline Parish Louisiana)

Catherine Prudhomme, Director
Evangeline Parish (Louisiana)
ESEA Bilingual Program

Most federal aid to education has geared itself to the needs of the disadvantaged child, that is the economically disadvantaged child. Bilingual education concerns itself with the linguistically and culturally different child who because of this "difference" has become disadvantaged in some way in the world of school. Federal guidelines for such programs are very clear in their insistance that parents of the children in the educational programs and the community-at-large be informed of and involved in the program. For this reason, all bilingual programs must have a "community-involvement component". It is the responsibility of the individual program administrators to see that these activities are implemented. Only through parent and community support can the program be termed successful.

The attitudes and life patterns among many parents of economically disadvantaged children often result in an

inability to give sufficient support to the efforts schools make to educate their children. Some parents, like some educators, believe the economically disadvantaged children can be educated only a limited extent. Lack of high expectations by parents, in turn, influences children's own expectations for themselves.

The parents look to the school with hope, but they are apprehensive and perplexed in relation to the school. Lack of communication, based on stereotyped thinking on the part of both parents and teachers, further inhibits the school's efforts. Although the parents have a much more positive attitude toward education than is generally believed, lack of communication alienates parents from the school and from active participation in the educational life of children.

The long range goal of the local school board is to achieve mutually supportive and reinforcing activities involving parents and community organizations and resources in the educational enterprise. The program is based on the premise that when parents, teachers children, and public and private community agencies become purposefully involved in the activities emanating from the school building, the children's aspirations and achievements will be modified significantly and positively.

Even when the child possesses high intellectual endowments and the best school facilities are provided,

learning cannot proceed appropriately without a stimulating home environment and adequate motivation. A supportive home environment--especially during the early years--can influence the development and maintenance of conditions for effective learning.

Parents contribute both directly and indirectly to the educational progress of their children. However, their ability to do so constructively is often limited by environmental, emotional, and intellectual factors. For example, the child arriving at school from an impoverished home often suffers deficiencies in language, health, motivation for learning, and limited "know-how" for functioning in the formalized school world. These deficiencies, characteristic of disadvantaged children to various degrees, tend to preclude normal progress in school achievement. In fact, the typical achievement pattern is one of cumulative deficiency. The roots of this dilemma can be traced directly to home environment, particularly to adult-child interaction during infancy and early childhood.

In many homes, the attention given to a small child is often supplanted by a new baby. The displaced former "baby" of the family may be left largely on his own or in the care of older siblings. From this point, it appears that social and intellectual development begins to suffer. The fact that intervention into the home

during this period is a crucial role for educators to assume is unquestioned.

Although one of the most important tasks a person undertakes is the rearing of children, little or no training for parenthood is provided. The most pressing needs are to encourage the parents to educate and to motivate their children, and to help the parents grow and educate themselves. Parents must be viewed as the child's first teachers, as potential aides to later public school teachers, or preferably, as both. Although they usually do not attempt to perform the formal tasks of the school, disadvantaged parents can be helped to provide intellectually and socially stimulating experiences that will contribute to the goals of the school.

While the school is striving to educate the children in the most meaningful manner and to meet the needs of disadvantaged preschool children, the needs and the real or potential abilities of the parents often are over looked. The parents of disadvantaged children possess many talents which economic deprivation and lack of opportunity have prevented from developing. An awareness of the following needs of parents of disadvantaged children is the focus of the program.

1. Lack of recognition on the part of parents themselves of the many worthwhile qualities that they possess
2. Inadequate understanding of how children grow and learn

3. Inabilities of the parents to appreciate and to cope with their children

4. Lack of meaningful roles in the community which will give the parents both confidence and enjoyment

5. Lack of regard on the part of parents for their own dignity and worth in the community

6. Lack of opportunity for parents to be involved in situations that allow opportunities to work with other racial, cultural and social groups

7. Little knowledge or understanding of private, public or government agencies in the community which could assist in the development of new or improved skills for better job opportunities

8. Lack of awareness of the assistance that families might receive from community resources and facilities in order to improve the economic status of the family

9. Lack of opportunities on the part of parents to discuss family, personal, and community problems with school staffs in order to obtain satisfactory solutions to these problems

10. Lack of rapport between the child's home and his school

11. Lack of motivation of parents to involve themselves in the activities of the school and of the community

12. Lack of understanding by parents of their child's need for ethical, moral, and social values

13. Limited knowledge of health and sanitation practices

Through mutual parent-school-community support and reinforcement of pupil effort and growth and through the involvement of the school's community in the community's schools, the education of the child becomes more purposeful. As these groups--parents, school personnel, children,

and public and private agencies--become purposefully involved in activities, the aspirations and achievements of both parents and children will be greatly enchanced. Expected outcomes are the following:

1. Increased contact of the parents with, and participation in, various activities of school and community
2. Positive attitudes toward the school as an institution
3. Increased responsibility of parents for educating and influencing the education of their children
4. Increased understanding of school and community affairs
5. Increased participation in both school and community projects
6. Positive improvement in the physical facilities in the home environment
7. Improvements in parent-child relationships
8. Effective utilization of community services

For school staffs (teachers, teacher aides, school administrators, and others), expected outcomes of the program include:

1. Increased understanding of the roles of parents in educating children
2. Increased cooperation with parents in educating children
3. Improved attitudes toward parents and their role in educating children

Three main focuses of parent and community involvement in the Evangeline Parish Bilingual Program are:

1. Community Agents
2. Lay Advisory Committee
3. Dissemination

Community Agents

The community agent activities were one of the most successful components of the 1974-75 bilingual project in Evangeline Parish. The community and parent support of the programs is attributed to their endeavors in this area. This component has been expanded to meet the expanded needs of the program. The duties of the community agents has become even more meaningful since they have profited from one year's experience.

One community agent is employed for each target school to work fifteen hours a week. These individuals bridge the gap which presently exists between low-income bilingual parents and the school. The community agent must of necessity be bilingual, a parent of a participant in the program, and a member of the community he serves. The agents are oriented in curriculum development and methodology for home-teaching procedures through various in-service training programs conducted by the project director.

Before beginning their work in the target schools, the community agents participate in a preservice workshop which serves both as an overview for continuing community agents from the previous year's project and an orientation for new community agents. Their duties are discussed and all profit from the experiences of last year's program. Continuous in-service training is also part of the

community agent's role. They attend monthly meetings which are held before the monthly lay advisory committee meeting. They also are present for this meeting so that they can help discuss and resolve pertinent issues coming before the parent-community advisory board.

Since community involvement is his primary objective, the agent obtains from each school the names of parents of the students involved in bilingual instruction. He engages parents in helping their children learn and in reinforcing concepts necessary for their development by visiting with them in their home or conducting parent meetings at school. He is responsible for distributing to parents information on what their children are learning in school and how it can best be reinforced in the home situation.

All six community relations specialists are responsible for holding "parents night" at each school where both the specialist and bilingual teachers present short summaries of what has been accomplished in the bilingual classroom, involve some of the children in presenting short bilingual programs for their parents at regular P.T.A. meetings, and conduct short question and answer sessions involving both parents and teachers. In these sessions, the specialists encourage parents to serve as voluntary aides in the classroom situation.

The community agents are responsible for helping the bilingual specialists publish a monthly newsletter informing the parents on the activities of the bilingual classroom. The agents review the newsletter with the parents at the monthly meetings at the school or in the homes when necessary and offer suggestions as to how to best re-inforce this learning in the homes. Thus parents will be brought into the bilingual programs as important catalysts in the learning situation. The gap between the home and school is thereby bridged by involving teachers, students, and parents in the learning process.

Lay Advisory Committee

The lay advisory committee to the bilingual education program consists of ten members. Six members are parents of children participating in the program who have expressed an interest in the program and have volunteered their services. Four members are community leaders who have been selected by their respective civic organizations to serve on the advisory committee. A varied and strong membership is thus assured.

The function of the advisory committee are concomitant with its primary goal of parents involvement which is to involve parents and school personnel and the community in a cooperative and sustained system of activities which will increase the education opportunities of the children, both in school and at home. It improves

school-home relationship by enabling parents and school personnel to define their relationship to each other. The committee provides teachers and administrators with opinions and viewpoints which will lead to a better analysis of the needs of the target population, and to more relevant program of training and consultative services. The committee makes recommendations concerning the needs of the target population and how these needs can be met through the bilingual program. Members are encouraged to submit comments concerning programmatic changes. Most of the functions are directly related to the planning, operation, and evaluation of the said program. Another primary function of the committee is to stimulate community rapport. In addition to liaison between other parents and citizens and the bilingual staff, it promotes better school-home relationships. The committee invites community members to participate in its proceedings and make suggestions for future action. It helps publicize school activities, particularly projects which have been successful and those for which community support is essential. As parents, committee members can better understand the help and information other parents may need. The more the committee becomes involved, the more positive the effect they will have on the community and the schools.

Through the advisory committee, an effective partnership between home, school and community results in a more relevant school program, greater community support for the schools, and a more comfortable relationship between teachers and parents, school officials and the community. This structured, organized advisory committee is a valid means of involving parents and the community in all relevant facets of the bilingual program, from its planning to its evaluation. The end result is the furthering of educational opportunities and achievement of the children involved. This is possible because parents have such an in-depth and long-term knowledge of their children - their strengths and weaknesses, their needs and their problems. The exchange of such information between a lay advisory committee and trained professionals is paramount in planning a better, more relevant, bilingual school program.

Dissemination

The project director writes at least one article per month, to be published in the local newspapers of the communities in which a target school is located. This article discusses some of the current objectives and results of the bilingual program in the communities involved. It also provides a sounding board for community response as it solicits questions and opinions

from members of the community to be answered and published in the newspaper.

The director also contributes articles to the monthly bilingual Newsletter currently being published by the School Board and prepared by the Director of the ESEA Bilingual Program.

The staff of the bilingual program publishes a brochure to be sent to both community and state interest groups. This brochure contains pertinent information on the activities of the bilingual program. It also contains pictures of actual classroom situations. The purpose of the brochure is to communicate with important interest groups who would not otherwise become acquainted with the bilingual program.

Along with the brochure, the staff offers the services of guest speakers who can be called upon at any time to speak at meetings or functions of said groups, thus transmitting even more current information to the public about the bilingual program.

Since funding for the Evangeline Parish ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program has been projected for another three years, the staff hopes to refine and expand the activities of the community-involvement component in order to meet the changing needs of the students and community it serves. These structured activities cannot help but ameliorate the relationship between school, home, and community. The overall objective of parent--

community involvement cannot help but result in the furthering of educational opportunities and improved achievement of the disadvantaged children involved.

A BILINGUAL PROGRAM GROWS UP

Prof. Joseph McSpadden*
University of Southwestern Louisiana

You want a "longitudinal scientific, objective appraisal of a bilingual program"? But I can't do that! That's my baby you're talking about - why, I was a part of the conception! I nursed that little fellow through the colick of new birth. I sat up nights when he felt poorly - I bathed him with the sweat of my brow! There were nights when I couldn't sleep for thinking of my baby. I literally ate, slept, thought my baby - my very existence was my baby! I'm proud of my baby. Of course, he's not a baby any more. He's five years old. He's grown up. Now he's on his own. He'll make it. He's strong! I've given him everything I knew and done everything I could do to prepare him for the time when I knew he'd have to go out on his own.

---

*From the inception of the Lafayette Parish Bilingual Program, Mr. McSpadden has served the Evaluator of the Program.

Scientific, objective - no, I can't be that. I can tell you some things about my baby - I mean my boy - I mean my big man - but not scientifically or objectively. Do you want to sit a spell?

Well, let's see. You know when he was born, there were not too many like him in the United States. At that time there were no mid-wives, like federal guidelines and publications. He just came into this world practically on his own. A little creativity and ingenuity on my part and of course, on the part of his other parents - but basically he had to stand on his own. From the day he was born until the time when he was considered an adult, and out on his own - he had to prove himself. He had a little help from those around him - his parents - a few doting aunts and uncles - those who loved him. But really, I guess he had to prove his own worth - he had to make his own contributions to this world - and he did too!

Do you know that while he was just a mite he was helping boys and girls to be proud of their French Acadian culture and heritage? Did you know that he was responsible for over 600 boys and girls becoming more familiar with their French language backgrounds. In fact, he taught a lot of them to read and write in French. Why one of the best things I think he did was to provide an opportunity for boys and girls who didn't

do as well in school as other children who spoke the English language better - to do just as well as those English speaking kids - and, in some cases, better!! I'm not just talking through my hat you know! What I'm saying to you has been written up in reports and you can see for yourself if you want to - that is if you can read all that math stuff!

I'll tell you something else about my boy - I mean my young man! While he was just a boy in knee pants, he was writing up curriculum materials in French. Do you know he wrote over 30 volumes of curriculum materials - plus he translated many of the Clovis Crawfish books into French? Did you know that over 250 volumes of these materials were disseminated out of the state of Louisiana, some even went to other countries and that 900 volumes have been sent to various people within the state of Louisiana. I'd say that's pretty good - to write something and have that many people in that many places want to read it!!

People from all over have heard of him. When he was growing up, we use to have visitors come from all over the United States, even foreign countries, just to see what made that boy so successful, they'd heard so much about him!!

Well, now you know why I'm so proud of my son. He's done a lot, I just shared a few things with you, but now that he's on his own - now that he's grown up - you can expect bigger and better things from him. He'll do it, he won't let you down. I may not be very objective, but I know my baby!!

PAST CHAIRMEN

NATIONAL FLES COMMITTEE/FLES-BILINGUAL EDUCATION SECTION

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF FRENCH

Edward H. Bourque
Director of Supervisory Services
Fairfield Public Schools
100 Reef Road
Fairfield, CN 06430

Professor Mary Ann Brown
Loop Junior College
Chicago, IL 60600

Professor Anita Cipriani
Hunter College Elementary School
The City University of New York
New York, NY 10022

Ms. Virginia Gramer
FLES Coordinator
Hinsdale Public Schools
Hinsdale, IL 60521

Professor John F. Kunkle
Department of Foreign Languages
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, LA 70501

Dr. Gladys C. Lipton
Bureau of Foreign Languages
Board of Education
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Professor Marjorie L. Pei
Graduate School of Education
Washington University
St. Louis, MS 63100

Professor Roger Pillet
The Graduate School of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60600

Professor Elizabeth Ratte
Department of Foreign Languages
Boston University
236 Bay State Road
Boston, MA 02100

Professor Virginia Spaar-Rauch
(Formerly) Associate Professor of French
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10021

Professor Lee Sparkman
Department of Linguistics
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98100

Sidney Teitelbaum
Supervisor of Foreign Languages
East Meadow Public Schools
East Meadow, NY

Ms. Margaret Lee Wood
Director, Foreign Languages
Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation
Chicago, IL 60600